

And Mr. SHADEGG responded, "Certainly. And I think we will." We do not believe that that has been done.

During that same debate, on June 14, I stated to the minority, "We expect to move forward on open rules." We have done that. "But I want to make clear, if we are subjected to what we believe were dilatory tactics, then that would not be consistent with the agreement, and therefore our provision would be that, in lawyers' terms, the agreement has been breached."

I also stated, and again I quote, "We are proceeding with reliance on the good faith of each to proceed in a manner that we believe accommodates what has been done last year and what we hope will be done this year, and that is consider these bills with the inclusion of earmarks in the bills in a manner that facilitates their being passed through this House."

In fact, Mr. HENSARLING stated, and again I quote, "I believe I heard that there is hopefully an expectation of open rules. I understand the majority leader's caveat." That was my caveat that dilatory tactics would not be employed during the course of consideration of appropriation bills.

He went on to say, "I understand there is an anticipation of unanimous consents," he said, "UCs, as historic norms dictate."

I carry around in my pocket, I've shared with my friend, Mr. BLUNT and Mr. BOEHNER, the times that we spent considering the appropriation bills last year. Those were the historic norms that we referred to when on the floor we talked about generally replicating the time constraints of last year.

"I understand," Mr. HENSARLING went on, "there is an anticipation that if bills are of historic norms, that debate time may be of historic norms."

Again, I say to my friends on the minority side, I believe we have followed those dictates and that understanding to the letter.

Now, as to the schedule, I want to tell my friends that I have, for many months, articulated the bills that we were going to consider this week. Among those bills were the appropriation bills, the Defense bill, the Agriculture appropriation bill. I've discussed with my friend, ROY BLUNT, the possibility of considering a FISA bill. We also have some conference reports. The WRDA conference report is ready, we believe. We're also going to consider the Defense appropriation bill, consistent with our agreement; and we're going to consider an energy bill.

There may be some other conference reports that will be ready. The Higher Education conference report possibly would be ready, although I think that may not occur. There are other bills that we're going to consider.

The reason I rise is, first of all, to discuss the agreement that we had, which I think has not been honored, with respect to the considerable appropriations bills. It was not with respect to other bills, but we were considering the appropriation bill.

And I tell my friend that I have discussed with the members of my caucus that we are going to complete this agenda. We will complete this agenda if it takes all of next week to complete. That will disrupt my schedule, it will disrupt your schedule, and it will not be a happy time for any of us in this body. I regret that.

I hope that those of you on the minority side who have dealt with me through the years believe that I try to treat one another as I want to be treated by them.

I regret that we are now going to go to the Rules Committee on the appropriations bills. We will go to the Rules Committee on the Agriculture appropriation bill. We will go to the Rules Committee on the Defense bill. We will go to the Rules Committee on each and every other bill.

That does not mean I expect you to sit back and simply say, well, that's fine. I expect that we will not have a happy time over the next coming days. But I also believe that you have not left me or my party with an alternative, if, in fact, we are to proceed with the people's business.

We have disagreements. That's fair. Amendments expressing those agreements offered on this floor is fair. Demanding votes on those amendments and on those bills is fair and what the American people expect.

What the American people, in my opinion, do not expect is for us to simply do nothing, to simply circle one another, yell and scream at one another, point fingers at one another and not proceed with their business.

We believe very strongly that children ought to have health care. I believe you think children ought to have health care. We have a difference of opinion as to how we accomplish that objective. That is fair.

What is not fair, from our perspective, is to simply disallow the House to proceed to do its business, to have its disagreements, to make its votes, to express its will.

And so I say to you that we will complete the agenda that I have set forth. I hope we pass all those bills. If we don't pass them, so be it. But if we pass, or whether they fail, we will consider them during this sitting, before we recess for our summer break. I regret that, but it is the only alternative with which I think I am left if, as majority leader of this House, I'm going to facilitate the accomplishment of the people's business.

Mr. BOEHNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. I appreciate my colleague yielding.

There is no question that there was an agreement between Mr. HOYER, Mr. OBEY and myself to try to facilitate the movement of the appropriation process. During the time in the minority, the Democrats worked with us to facilitate that process; and over the course of the last 4 or 5 weeks I think

that it has worked reasonably well. Maybe not to everyone's satisfaction, but reasonably well.

What's happened here is that we have the greatest expansion of government-run health care about to go out to the floor, where there's never been a legislative hearing in the Energy and Commerce Committee on this issue. The bill has not gone through committee. We're about, as the minority, about to have this thrust upon us, a 488-page bill that was in the committee that no one ever really had a chance to read; and to bring this in such a rush in the last week has caused concern amongst members in our caucus from every wing of our caucus.

Now I understand that the gentleman would prefer that we move the appropriations process quickly. But there was a discussion all of last year and the year before and a lot of promises made earlier this year about having a more open House, allowing Members the opportunity to debate, allowing the opportunity for the Members to bring amendments to the floor; and I and my colleagues on our side are very disappointed that not only have not all of those promises been kept, that we've actually regressed beyond the time that we were in the majority. And so it is unfortunate that we find ourselves at this spot. All that we've asked, all year, is to be treated fairly.

And I would say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I understand that we have differences. I'm a big believer that we ought to allow the House to work its will. But, at the end of the day, for us to work our will and for other Members to work their will, there needs to be more open debate. There needs to be more opportunities for amendments. And I will say, from the point of view of the minority, all we're asking is to be treated fairly.

In 1995, when we took the majority for the first time in 40 years, some of my colleagues in the Republican leadership wanted to treat the minority, the new minority the way we had been treated. I argued that we should never do that, that we should treat the minority the way we asked to be treated. And over the course of, again, the last several years, you have made your case about how you wanted to be treated and how the minority should be treated. You made it very clear.

We're there. And I think all we're asking, all we're asking is that you treat us the way you wanted to be treated. And if that, in fact, is the case, we can do our work. We can do what the American people sent us here to do. But we can't do it when our voices are stifled and our constituents are not allowed to be represented with their views on the floor of this House.

So I regret that it has come to this. It is going to be a tough week, but we are not going to sit here representing nearly half the American people and not allow their voices to be heard.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time. That was the proposition that the gentleman put to us and Mr. OBEY when